REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Summary of Telephone Interview

Claims 1-27 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1, 11, and 19 have been amended to clarify the meaning of a term used in the claims.

On February 22, 2006, applicants' attorney conducted a telephone interview with Examiner Wimer to discuss subparagraph (a) of Claim 1 (and related recitation in the other independent claims). It was noted that applicants' Claim 1 was previously amended to clearly recite "a support adapted to be removably coupled and physically mounted to a wireless device at a predefined distance from at least one of an existing internal antenna system," and to recite that "the external antenna system includes an external antenna that is physically mounted on and physically supported by the wireless device." Applicants' attorney then pointed out that this configuration is illustrated in several of the drawing figures filed with the application. The Examiner was then directed to details of the antenna base shown by Kuramoto (U.S. Patent No. 6,816,120) in Figures 2 and 4, and as discussed in regard to Figure 4, at col. 3, lines 58-64. It was noted that Kuramoto clearly indicates that a coaxial cable is provided extending from a side of the base, apparently to connect to a device with which the antenna will be used.

In regard to the Examiner's statement in the current Office Action concerning his belief that Figure 9 of Kuramoto indicates that it would be obvious for the disclosed antenna base to be physically mounted to and supported by a wireless device, applicants' attorney directed the Examiner to col. 5, lines 39-44 in the reference and noted that there is no teaching or suggestion that the block shown in Figure 9 is any type of wireless device or that the antenna is actually physically mounted on and supported by a wireless device. Figure 9 of Kuramoto simply shows a rectangle supporting the base of the antenna, but does not identify the rectangle, so that it might be a table, a box, but need not be viewed as being a wireless device. The Examiner agreed that Kuramoto does not explicitly teach that the rectangle is a wireless device, as recited in applicants' claims, but reiterated his position that one of ordinary skill in the art would likely find it obvious to employ a wireless device to support the antenna.

Applicants' attorney then pointed out that applicants' claims recite that the support is "removably coupled and physically mounted to a wireless device at a predefined distance from at

least one of an existing internal antenna system and an existing external antenna system thereof," but that Kuramoto does not teach any such relationship in regard to the base of the antenna. The Examiner pointed out that the thickness of the base might be viewed as a predefined distance. It was then suggested that the independent claims be amended to recite that the predefined distance is in regard to a wavelength (e.g., a ¼ wavelength), since that distinction is shown in the drawings (and discussed in the specification). The Examiner indicated that he would be favorably disposed to consider claims thus amended as distinguishing over the Kuramoto reference, and suggested the applicants' attorney submit that change to the independent claims as a faxed response to the outstanding Final Office Action. Applicants' attorney agreed.

Applicants' attorney would like to thank Examiner Wimer for his willingness to discuss this case and to consider a resolution that should advance the case to issue.

Claims Rejected under 35 USC § 103

In this Final Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1-6, 8, 10-15, 18-21, and 24-27 as unpatentable over Kuramoto (U.S. Patent No. 6,816,120. The Examiner indicated that Kuramoto teaches most of the elements or steps of these claims and that any aspect of the claims that are not specifically taught, would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Claims 7, 9, 16, 17, 22, and 23 are rejected over Kuramoto as applied in rejecting the first group of claims, and further in view of Johnson (U.S. Patent No. 6,208,300), which discloses a director.

However, as noted in the discussion set forth above in the Summary of Telephone Interview, it is applicants' position that the cited art fails to teach "a support adapted to be removably coupled and physically mounted to a wireless device at a predefined distance relative to a wavelength of the wireless signals, from at least one of an existing internal antenna system and an existing external antenna system thereof, where the external antenna system includes an external antenna that is physically mounted on and physically supported by the wireless device." The Examiner appears to at least agree that the cited art fails to teach that the predefined distance is "relative to a wavelength of the wireless signals." Since a generally equivalent amendment has been made to each of independent claims 1, 11, and 19, all of these claims should be allowable. Further, since dependent claims are allowable for at least the reasons that the independent claim on which the dependent claims ultimately depend, it is submitted that the above amendment places all of the claims into condition for allowance.

In consideration of the above Remarks, applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of all claims in the application and pass the case to issue. Should any further questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is asked to telephone applicants' attorney at the number listed below. Applicants' attorney again wants to thank Examiner Wimer for his consideration of these matters during the telephone interview.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronald M. Anderson

Con anderson

Registration No. 28,829

FAX CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office at facsimile number 571-273-8300, on February 22, 2006.

Date: February 22, 2006

-8-

LAW OFFICES OF RONALD M. ANDERSON 600 - 108th Avenue N.E., Suite 507 Bellevue, Washington 98004

MS 303707.01 MICR0402-1-1\0402AM 02-22-2006.doc